

The Trilateral Commission and the Political Assassination Investigation

Christopher B. Sharrett
Doylestown, PA 18901

Origins of the "Eastern Establishment"

In his brilliant new book /1/ Carl Oglesby outlines the origins of clandestinism in America. He traces its source to two large power blocs, the "Yankees" or the Eastern Establishment (as represented by the Morgan and Rockefeller financial groups and their allies) and the "Cowboys" or the nouveau riche industrialists of the Southwest and California, who have amassed huge profits from the aerospace complex and Pentagon contracts (represented by such groups as the Hughes conglomerate).

Oglesby states that the political assassinations of the past decade can be attributed to a rivalry between these power blocs. He underscores his thesis by citing the research of other historians, notably Carrol Quigley /2/, to show how the clandestine power struggle is rooted in the economic and ideological inclinations of the extremely right-wing Cowboy faction vs. the more pragmatic, even quasi-liberal Yankees. Both Oglesby and Quigley state that the East has always concentrated on the development and preservation of capitalism in the major industrial nations, and were not beyond making deals with the communist powers if this could serve the ends of Yankee economic survival. The emerging Cowboy interests, however, were less compromising with socialist aspirations and placed a good deal of emphasis on interventionist activities in Third World nations as a means of developing their multinational corporate empire. It is Oglesby's contention that the assassinations of the '60s were attempts by the Cowboy factions to wrest control from the Eastern Establishment. The victory of Jimmy Carter may indicate that (a) the Oglesby view is correct and (b) the Eastern Establishment has regained control.

The Council on Foreign Relations and the "Round Table"

Oglesby also states that the Eastern Establishment, in the person of Morgan and Rockefeller, always placed emphasis on the development and patronage of privately-funded "think tanks" as a means of dealing with foreign policy and of influencing democratically elected officials. The earliest representations of these "think tanks" were the "Round Tables" and the Council on Foreign Relations; members of these groups are examined extensively by historian Quigley /3/ and included the Dulles brothers and John McCloy, individuals very responsible for the development of the CIA and the Pentagon. Although the Old Guard of Yankee power is gone, another offspring of Eastern influence is evidenced in the Trilateral Commission, a group mentioned frequently in today's news as well as in a previous issue of "PURSUIT" /4/.

Yankee Influence in Previous Administrations

The Rockefeller-inspired Trilateral Commission, which includes in its membership Carter and Mondale as well as Secretary of State Cyrus Vance, Secretary of Defense Harold Brown and National Security Advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski, is not the first representation of Yankee influence in an administration. Cyrus Vance and Harold Brown were also present in the Kennedy and Johnson eras, as were other Yankee "gun-slingers" /5/ such as Averill Harriman, Walt Rostow, McGeorge Bundy, George Ball, Clark Clifford, and others who show up in the Pentagon Papers and the annals of the Vietnam War. Fletcher Prouty argues that these "think tank" personalities are part of the keystone of a "Secret Team" which controls American policies. /6/

Goals of the Trilateral Commission

Despite attempts by the news media /7/ /8/ to underplay the role of the Trilateral Commission in the Carter Administration, it is fair to assert that a change of power has taken place other than that which is most obvious to citizens. The Commission, like its predecessors in the Council on Foreign Relations and the Round Table groups, is interested in reinforcing the influence of the major industrial nations of the Western world and Japan. It is also obvious that multinational corporations will have a tremendous say on how policies are enacted; Coca-Cola, Exxon, Sears Roebuck as well as the Rockefeller-owned Chase Manhattan Bank are among the many firms backing the Trilateralites. /9/

What is very distressing about the Trilateral Commission, however, is that the old Yankee facade of "liberalism" may be considerably diminished. Trilateral theorists Brzezinski and Samuel Huntington presented a paper to the Commission in 1975 which suggested that an "excess of democracy" is one cause of international strife. /10/ Brzezinski has long been known as a rabid anti-Communist and a leading academic apologist for Vietnam.

"Revenge" for the Kennedy Assassinations?

Of greatest interest to many researchers, including readers of "PURSUIT", is the possible influence of the Trilateral Commission on the continuing research into the domestic assassinations. It is important to note, for example, that a member of the House Select Committee on Assassinations, Republican John B. Anderson, is a member of the Commission as well.

Currently there are two schools of thought on how the Carter Administration and the Trilateral Commission

may affect the assassination inquiry. One view is that the CIA, which is after all an invention of the Eastern Establishment, will want to protect what is left of its integrity and will continue to blockade the investigation. The news media, controlled by the Yankees, is already publishing negative stories about the House Committee and its chief counsel, Richard A. Sprague — the process used to discredit the investigator looks similar to the fate of Jim Garrison.

Another view is that the Yankees, with the help of the Trilateralites, will continue to restructure the CIA and to present the image of open government; part of this process may be to actually reveal part of the truth about the assassinations in such a way that Johnson and Nixon take most of the blame — in short, the Cowboys, or rather, a "splinter element" of that group is shown to be responsible for the political murders. In this way the invisible government as a whole stays relatively intact.

Carter's Role

It is difficult to say how knowledgeable President Carter is of the various cover-ups and the original assassination conspiracies. It is a safe assumption, however, that he will not have an easy time if he openly supports investigations — unless the strategy of the power structure has indeed changed radically. According to one source, Carter does not support an all-out inquiry./11/ The situation with the Carter Administration thus far seems very much like the Kennedy period, with Carter having conflict with the government on some key issues, such as defense spending. It may be that Carter is essentially naive to the workings of the power-control group and of his backer, the Trilateral Commission — if so he will need to learn very fast if he is to survive. In any case, Americans should realize that the problems of this nation have not gone away with Carter's pledge of openness, and that the age of inquiry begun with Watergate is only just starting to reveal the nature of governmental deceit.

Notes

1. Carl Oglesby, "The Yankee and Cowboy War," (Kansas City: Sheed, Andrews and McMeel, 1976).
22. Carroll Quigley, "Tragedy and Hope," (Macmillan, 1966).
3. Quigley, pp. 929 - 956.
4. Christopher B. Sharrett, "The 1976 Presidential Elections: Aftermath," "People in the PURSUIT of Truth," Dec. 1976.
5. Oglesby, p. 161.
6. L. Fletcher Prouty, "The Secret Team: The CIA and its Allies in Control of the United States and the World," (Prentice Hall, 1973).
7. "Carter's Brain Trusts," "Time," Dec. 20, 1976, p. 19.
8. William Greider, "Trilateralists to Abound in Carter's White House," "The Washington Post," Jan. 16, 1977.
9. "Ibid."
10. "Ibid."
11. Penn Jones, "News Briefs," "The Continuing Inquiry," Nov. 22, 1976, p. 16. □

Mailer — Continued from page 1

an order that came to Jack Ruby out of the chain of communication that ran between the CIA and the Mafia, then we do not know which history we can act upon.

Now we have a new administration seeking to take America out of the historical despondency of the last

Salandria — Continued from page 6

seem to value freedom. But some of us still believe that without freedom, human beings cannot become fully human and that freedom is therefore supremely valuable. Perhaps the forces that now menace freedom are too strong to be resisted for very long. It is still our duty to do whatever we can to resist them."

24. What Are We to Do?

In accord with Huxley's sense of duty, what can we do? We can look at humanity as a species with a proud past, a difficult present and a troubled but still-hopeful future. Each of us can draw strength from the past. From the past we must draw upon those traditions which offer to mankind purpose, identity and love of his fellow man.

Each of us must draw strength from the present. From the present we must seek to understand power and the tools of mind control. We must presently accept that tyranny has gained new and effective technology in its age-old war against man's liberty. In studying the present we must raise our threshold of fear so that we can face hard truth. Hard truth will tell us that everywhere power seeks to defeat man's individuality, to program man to be alienated from all other men; to manipulate man to seek pleasure and not responsibility. The present task of those who love humanity is to get men and women to move, work, and join together in common love of human freedom, knowledge and justice.

For the future, what are we to do? We must unite in the task of freeing humanity from a drugged and pleasure-driven servitude. Should we be successful in joining people together, this work will transform our future world by defeating the somatized slavery of a Brave New World. Then we can remake our world into one which is marked by social justice, human freedom and a more equitable distribution of wealth.

As a first small effort towards these ends, let us engage now in a discussion wherein we will use the Kennedy assassination not as a mechanism for practicing a debilitating exercise in double-think, but rather let us use the assassination as a means of expanding our understanding of our times. □

decade. How promising if this new administration and Congress will recognize that the assassinations of the sixties are not old scars to be covered, but unseen bruises that still deaden the confidence of America!

For the shadow of the assassinations keeps us thinking we do not have a history that can bear exposure. That is a deadening suspicion. Basic to good feeling about our country is our ability to believe that our representatives are brave enough to undertake thoroughgoing investigations of the role of government itself, no matter where that may lead! Such a need will obviously not be satisfied by stopping the work of the "House Select Committee on Assassinations".

We, the undersigned, send this letter to President Carter and to the House of Representatives in the hope it will serve the idea that the continuing life of the "Select Committee" and the voting of an appropriation adequate to its needs are matters of significance to the psychic well-being of this Republic.

Respectfully signed,

Norman Mailer, E.L. Doctorow, Allen Ginsburg, Joseph Heller, Joyce Carol Oates, James Purdy, Mark Schorer, Wilfred Sheed, William Styron, Hunter Thompson, Kurt Vonnegut, Jr., [17 other authors' signatures]. □